

The whole, although so generally accepted, naming of a Zend language does not seem, by the way, according to everything that has been recalled above, to be much more appropriate than if one wanted to call the language of the Mosaic books, the Torah language, or the Hellenistic dialect of the New Testament, the Gospel language. We must ask about the people “who spoke this language, and so we now turn from these remarks about the original language and language of the Zoroastrian books, as the context of the subject itself leads us, to what the author of the *Urvolke* and *Zendvolke*, and the original residences of the same, as well as of the emigrations from this Uriande to other areas according to the instructions of the Zoroastrian books. “The *Zendvolk*,” he explains from one of them (see 21), ‘lived’ (in the happy primeval times before the coming of winter and the emigration to lower and warmer climes) ”in the land of Eeri, Ari.” I do not find the name “*Zendvolk*” in the passage quoted; but according to the teachings of these books and say, it is about the first people and tribe of humans. What was the name of this people, or which people was it that lived in the land of Ari? The ancients call it, after the land itself, the people of the Aryans; and without doubt, the land of Eriene also refers to the province of Aria or Ariana of the Greeks, today's Khorasan. For the latter, I refer to the judgment of a learned friend, whose authority in the field of Persian archaeology is of the greatest and most recognized weight, the Privy Councillor von Hammer, who kindly shared his opinion with me, but at the same time pointed out that even Ver, which means Iran in the *Shahname*, should by no means be confused with Persis ; the city of Verene, however, could not be Persepolis, as Anquetil quite rightly maintains, but the Hekatompylos of the Greeks, the capital of ancient Parthia and the Albordi the mountains of Khorasan, but in a broader sense the whole chain of mountains from the Caucasus to the Himalayas. The province of Aria is, however, also a mountainous highland, as Eriana is described, and from the Paropamisus flow some of the rivers that water Bactria and Sogdiana; which fits the location that the author cites on page 25. Incidentally, it is certainly possible that Aria may have had a broader meaning and extent in the historical sense than the boundaries and location given to this province in the geographical system of the Greeks. Even a Greek writer (in Creuzer, symbol. J. p. 698. Note 40) and p. 736 Note 90) speaks of “the entire Aryan tribe” (rār 70 Apeñ or yeros), as of a large, widespread family of peoples; and in the Indian law code of Menu, the land of the Aryans, Ariaverta, is given an almost immeasurable extent through the Indian northern mountains to the eastern and western seas.

Let us we now remember that the Medes were called Aryans in ancient times, i.e. that the Medes were a people of “the great Aryan tribe”^a, which only later adopted the Median name, then suddenly much becomes clear that previously seemed dark and insoluble. We We now need the historical evidence that Zoroaster was a Mede, while the Zend books always point only to Eriana, and we must not discard it, because the two are not at all contradictory. What What we have so far called Zend language would perhaps, according to what those Zoroastrian sources themselves suggest about the true homeland and tribe of this doctrine, be more correctly recognized and regarded as an Aryan language, or, if you like, as an East Nedian, in contrast to the western Medeic, Pehlavi language; provided that the so-called Zend language, which we call the Aryan language, turns out on closer inspection to be an old tribal language, not a mixed dialect of more recent origin. he name of this great people, the Aryans, is also very remarkable. The Indian root Ar i, from which it can best be derived, means excellent and outstanding, glorious, egregious; in the sense that a warlike, heroic people are accustomed to giving themselves such names. Indeed, the other West-Medial name, Pehlavan, heroes; and when the Persians called their heroic ancestors Artäer, then this name even has a similarity to that of the Aryans; a similarity to which, however, we do not want to attach any etymological validity. from a quite different root, but in a similar relationship and meaning of the name, the nearby people of the Aspians, on the eastern slopes of the Paropamisus, towards the Indus, can be added. The t is not difficult to explain the meaning of this

name; for as *aspo*, *asp* in Indian as in Persian, and also in the Zend or Arian language, is a *ros*, the transition (as in Homeric *iaearora*) is easily found here, and this name of the people is again one of those by which warlike, rustling peoples are so often designated or designate themselves. have mentioned the *Aspi* here because of this, because that much-used *Asp* occurs so frequently in the old family name of the Zoroastrian books and the Media-Persian heroic saga that it deserves to be noticed. But there is still another relationship for the name of the Aryans that concerns us much more closely. For the Indian root *Ari* is indisputably also a Germanic one, and one that is still in use in the language, even in life; if one can say this differently from the "honor." According to our language analogy and the present form of this root, that people's name would mean about as much as the honorables, that is, the honorable, the noble; in a similar way to how the name of the "heirs" or "weirs" was used as the epitome of the free landowners and men capable of bearing arms, as the name of the entire people. In the earlier and Gothic form, that root also reads *ari* or *ario* in German; and those who have carefully observed how far this root. *Ar i* or *Ario* in ancient Germanic history and saga, among so many heroic and family names and otherwise, is widespread and predominant, it will not be strange if I add that for me it has long since become an historical assumption, for which I have found many confirmations, that our Germanic ancestors, while they were still in Asia, there, especially under the name of the Aryans, or, to put it more appropriately with the aforementioned Greek, under "the whole great Aryan family of peoples"; whereby the old saying and opinion of the kinship of the Germans, or Germanic and Gothic peoples, with the Persians would suddenly receive a completely new light and gain a definite historical point of reference. I do not want to attach any importance to the fact that in the dictionary of the Zend or, as I would now prefer to say, the Arian language, some German roots and words occur that are striking because of their complete similarity, since such details can also be found among very distant or completely foreign peoples. even that Chowaresm according to Mirchond (see v. Hammer's History of Persian Rhetoric, p. 137), otherwise called *Dschermania*, as remarkable as it remains in comparison with what Herodotus mentions of an ancient Persian origin of the Germanic peoples, as one of the three agricultural peoples (see von Hammer's remark in the same place), may not yet be considered decisive, since the agreement of the name may be coincidental, as in the apparent similarity of the name of the Indian *samanāer*, which means something quite different and denotes the followers of Buddha in contrast to the followers of Brahma; since, in any case, the name of the Germanic peoples, which was so widespread later on, only originated much later at the western Roman border from ancient Saxons, according to undeniable historical evidence. But it seems even stranger that Bokhara means "the gathering place of sciences" in the language of the ancient Maghen, according to Mirchond (in von Hammer's work), but in the Gothic language of Ulfilas, known known *Bokareis*, means a scholar; and I do not want to deny that I, as the first historically known or Eilen in Asia, indeed believe the country of Chowaresm and Bokhara to be allowed to consider. Be y this whole compilation about the Aryan people and their name, it was not on the thread of etymological language affinity, and the joy of weaving this further was not the only thing in mind; rather, it gives something that is also historically important in other respects.

De nothing is so essential and provides so much information when studying an ancient people (I am talking about those Asian and European peoples who have a tradition and traces of ancient culture) as to decide first whether it was a priestly people, like the Indians, the Egyptians, Hetrurians, or a nation of warriors, i.e., a nation founded by the warrior

caste, or in which the latter prevailed.

Not not as if the warrior peoples had no priests, just as the priestly peoples mentioned were not without a warrior caste; it depends only on the predominant element.

The The commercial peoples, as well as all those in general in whom some other and third element in addition to the two mentioned has determined the predominant character in all life arrangements, set aside here; the two main classes in the entire ancient world known to us are, on the one hand, the priestly peoples and, on the other, the warlike, heroic or noble peoples. The latter are mostly, or at least very often, identified as such by their names. Thus, even today, the marauding peoples raised for war in India, such as the Mahratten (Grosrajahs) and Rasputten (sons of the Rajahs), are named after the warrior caste. A similar meaning is also found in the two most comprehensive names of the ancient Germanic peoples: Teutons, i.e. Thiudans, in Gothic kings, princes, lords, nobles; and Goths, i.e. nobles (like Gothakunds, from edlem

stamm). so heisen now also the old Medes Pehlvan, i.e. heroes, just as the Medes of Zoroaster were certainly a noble heroic people; and the same is meant by the name of the Aryans, from whom the Medes descended, as we have explained above from the Indian root of the meaning of this name and have shown that even in the old Germanic language it is the same.

The ancient caste system, to which the course of the investigation has led us here, is touched upon by the author in such a superficial and unsatisfactory manner (see 49) that it appears to have its origins in the division and fragmented organization of the Indian tribes that took place as early as the first immigration,

and he does not really offer us any material from this side to engage with him further on this point. To be able to do this, we would first of all need to know whether he considers the caste system for ancient and at least the first principles to be antediluvian, or at least completed immediately after the great catastrophe, or modern, and only established since the emergence of peoples and states? — As for the description of the confused and fragmented state of the Indians, we do not know where the author took the reasons for this; but it is certain that his view of the Indians themselves lacks all clarity; which with the multitude of sources, the non-historical chronology, from which we still have not completely shaken off in Indian studies,

with the conflicting opinions of European scholars about it, etc., is easy to understand, so long as there is a lack of critical reference and historical support to organize the whole. The one great contradiction that reigns in Indian tradition and literature itself, namely, between the religion of Brahma and the teachings of the Buddha, which Alexander's Greeks already found there, in the two sects or religious parties of the Brahmins and the Samanäer, can be historically reconciled and explained; and this fact, which has changed and divided everything in India and among the peoples dependent on India for their intellectual culture, is precisely the historical starting point through which light and order come into the whole, as I will try to show elsewhere *).

) Regarding the objections that the author raises against the authenticity and the age of the already mentioned Indian law book of Menu, in relation to William Jones and my

theory, I will only say that I am not at all surprised. The question of the original state, and how it was constituted, about which Hüllmann recently gave us such interesting research, the author has completely ignored, despite the fact that he otherwise carefully considers the entire primitive state in religion and language, as well as with regard to the originally inhabited land of the first human tribe; which may be all the less missed in his investigation, since he does not yet seem to have considered the actual point of view for it. Above all, the question would have had to be asked and decided, which is not unimportant in so many respects, whether the estates, that is, in the ancient world, the castes are older or the state? Namely, the state in its proper sense as an institution of peace secured by the power of war, which, although based on internal peace, is nevertheless directed towards external peace or war, and, although of variable extent, the still as a moral individual entity has its borders, strictly closed to the outside world. We leave this aside here; only about the use that the people makes of the concept of an original people or peoples is the place here to remember some more. Actually, the generally popular term "Urvolk" is not correct if one, as the author does in the main, assumes a unity of descent; for then one cannot speak of a Urvolke, but only of an original tribe, from which all peoples are derived, and by which

is understood precisely the state of humanity that expressed in the treatise on language and wisdom of the Indians, in the earlier writing (On the age and value of some ländischen Urkunden) vorgetragen hat; so will ich hier : gelegentlich nur bemerken, das dieselben in so weit vollkommen gegründet sind, das gar nicht die Rede davon seyn kann, ob dieses Werk vom Menu selbst herrühre, da ja das Gegentheil aus dem 3 Werke g klar ist. Jones's judgment, however, is based entirely on the antiquity of the language; and if I followed the judgment and the great authority of William Jones on this point at the time, I still find no reason to deviate from it for the time being. However, it is only a relatively high age that can be inferred from the antiquity of the language; but that the Indian law code of Menu, despite this major limitation of the alleged high age , , a source of ancient lore that should not be underestimated ; the author himself seems to acknowledge that, since he takes it into account and uses it as such several times.

The author also assumes that the division into peoples took place at the same time as the emergence of the individual peoples. Of course, those who do not assume a common descent, but assume that man has grown out of the earth everywhere, are different in nature, depending on the different nature of the land, are quite right in their sense when they speak of primeval peoples but now in the plural, since they have once abolished the primeval historical unity and do not want to accept it. The author, who apparently prefers the system of unity and endeavors to prove that all peoples emigrated from the one primeval land (the central highlands of Asia) and came from there, is therefore only inconsistent when he also occasionally (see pages 48 and 52) speaks of primeval peoples who are said to have lived here and there in the ravines of the great high mountains, like a rare species of animal in lonely places, and are still to be found; an opinion which, if we are not mistaken, he borrowed from Ritter, an otherwise very excellent geographical writer, who, however, still adheres to this hypothesis of autochthons, despite the wealth of ethnographic facts and observations that he so ingeniously presents, in his largely organized main features quite obviously leading back to an original unity of all peoples derived from the three main tribes.

Let us now return to the primeval land of Eerien, as

it is described in the Zendavesta; it is evident from the way the other lands are connected to it and lined up around it that it is quite historically and geographically defined sense, but equally

as the ancestral homeland of the Aryan people, as the main country of origin in the middle of the other countries

. According to the author's own rule, in

every ancient world historical tradition, one must above all carefully distinguish the general from the particular, the nationally peculiar from the geographi

cally local. For example, in the

Zendsage Dsche mschid, for example, such a point of reference to the universal,

since it not only in this, but also in the mo=

faischen and many other Asian traditions, such a

great place in the derivation and history of the descent

of peoples. Afterwards, there are also some

individual, fruitful traces, such as the saga of the nine

human couples who wandered across the sea, and therefore, as

the author interprets it (see 54 and 55), perhaps

first populated Africa, contains a very nice indication. In the geographical world and country overview of

Zendavesta, however, everything seems to be local. First, Eriene,

or Ariland, is a very specific one, the homeland of the

Aryans, initially the Aria of the ancients. Among the fifteen

regions and places, which are arranged around this center,

the first are quite clear and not subject to any doubt,

sogdiana and Bactria. Among the following,

many are in doubt and subject to different interpretations;—

although not in the geographical sense situated south of the former,

they can nevertheless for the most part in the climatic sense

be described as valleys and lowlands towards the old mountain home

as the warmer ones. The eastern provinces stand out particularly clearly, notably the Sindian provinces of Kabul

and Lahore or Punjab; also Candahar, the Ara=

chosia of the ancients, and the land on the Hindmend river. The

intention of the author of the ancient document was perhaps less

to depict “the great family of Aryan peoples” in

their common descent, which was at least

certainly not his only purpose, but rather at the same time also— great Mediaeval Empire, as it followed the Assyrian and

preceded the Persian, according to its wide extent of all the

peoples and countries belonging to it or bordering on it

in its geographical — to include and to mark

. It is remarkable that, according to the above-mentioned

more correct explanation of Ver and Verene, Persis

does not appear in this table of countries, nor does Babylonia or Susiana

; and of Assyria only the northernmost part adjacent to Armenia – and even this is still doubtful – but not in the broader sense of the Assyrian empire. The outermost border of this large area, as described in the table of countries, is formed to the west by Armenia, provided that the sixteenth region to the south, Rengheiao *), is correctly identified in the Pehlvi Arvestanoven as the northern Assyria bordering Armenia (Kleuker ũl. p. 303.). From the above it seems to follow that this list of countries in the Zend-Avesta is neither an Assyrian-Babylonian nor a Persian one (after the empire founded by Cyrus), but quite definitely a Medes list of countries. If this point can be taken as certain, then this can cast a great deal of light on the whole, even if some details remain difficult and)

According to Görres' opinion in his recently published translation

of the Shahname, introduction, see XLIX. Rengheia is the province of Zarangia, sarreng.;
o

remains unclear. It would be highly desirable for a scholar who is familiar with all the tools of ancient Asian geography and oriental linguistics to equip us with this entire Medeic list of countries, as it appears in the Vendidad (Fargard 1. by Kleuker, Th. II. pp. 299–304) from which Mr. Rhode selected only some parts that best suited his hypothesis, explainable for once for the reason Then a definite judgment could be made as to whether there is any reason to assume a twofold and double Ariland and Eeriene; one according to the author as the first and original homeland of the Aryans in the north or northwest of Sogdiana , which, however, remains only a hypothesis; the other, the main and central land of the Mede, founded by the Aryans, namely, the Aria of the ancients, which is historically and geographically certain. — Towards the northwest, this 13 Aryan land table in the Zend-Avesta extends, as already noted, in the furthest case no further than towards Armenia, or to northern Assyria. The other end point towards the southeast is all the more clearly defined; it is formed by the fifteenth region of blessing, Hapte Heando, or the seven Indies, of which the document adds, oddly enough, that this region of blessing “ surpasses all other world empires in size and extent.” — this fact already compels us to look for the composition of these books in the vicinity of India; for only in the vicinity of India

could one have such a vivid and full concept —
of the size, population and importance of this region of the world.
But the Aryan people are also
clearly identified in an Indian source as being related to the Indian
in terms of their origin and language. In that much-discussed
passage of Menu's law code (which the author
considers in his other work "On the age and
"value of some oriental documents", see p. 64), where it is
about the warrior castes that have become wild due to their distance from the Brahmins and neglect of
Brahminical customs and customs, the savage warrior castes and the peoples that arose from them,
it says at the end: "All these are Dasyus (or war-oriented
nations) they may now speak the language of the Mleechas
"or that of the Aryans." The Mleechas are bar-
varische, the Indians in tribe and language foreign peoples.
And since here is obviously a contrast between these and
the Aryans, it is just as much as if it
said: they are all wild and depraved marauders, whether they are barbarians or really the Indians tribe-
and language-related Aryans.

If the author now takes his Eeriene world history in
a much broader sense than the Zendavesta, and
understands the entire Urland after the flood, thus the central highlands of

Asia, then there is nothing to be said against it in this respect
. But then he should also remain true to this broad

view and not himself again limit it one-sidedly,

since it goes without saying that in the prehistoric

tradition of every people, according to the particular locality,
the point closest to him is emphasized the most.

The author himself admits that the Caucasus

could well have formed "a second asylum" (p. 29) and that there could have been

more than one Urland" (p. 28); we would
rather give the one Urland
a wider scope from the outset and not define it so narrowly
. Also, it should not be overlooked how far

into distant parts of the world the same name of great mountains

and countries in the ancient world is often extended and transferred;

e.g. the name of the Caucasus, the Imaus, and finally how the name of Asia itself? — If, then, the Himalayas and the Hindu Kush are nearest to the Indian (see 24) and are mentioned first in the Indian tradition; if the Altai (see 52) is the starting point for the first immigration of the North-Asian peoples, and the Urals mark the great, old route of peoples (see 53) to the Occident, the northern and central Europe; so also Moses should not be regarded in passing so carelessly because he lets the tribal father Noah first from the mountain Ararath with his ark to gain a firm foothold; because everything points us to the same middle highlands and primeval mountains of Asia in all its wide ramifications. If Anquetil's opinion were correct, which Eerene at the foot of the Alborz — bordi sets in the country, which is watered by the Kur and Araxes, then the statement of the Zendavesta according to this interpretation would very closely agree with that of Moses. According to the above, this explanation by Eerene is probably not acceptable; however, an exact match is not to be expected or sought here. Meanwhile, where the interpretation of ancient geography is subject to so many doubts, and the best opinion is mostly only the more probable one, we should realize that, because of a preconceived opinion, we should not so easily reject any ancient Asian tradition,

30 *

let alone the Mosaic record.
We will conclude this communication, which may have become too detailed anyway, with this.

If I have succeeded in convincing him that Moses and Genesis can be seen differently than he has understood them so far, I would be

happy if my expectation in this regard is not disappointed or exceeded. In any case, however, my intention was to keep all one-sidedness away from the original historical/archaeological research with the utmost seriousness and to show that what is only too often presented as completely contrary or even conflicting is, when properly understood, quite consistent. Finally, it is surely time that the two witnesses of the living truth and clear knowledge of antiquity – “writing and nature” – are no longer used against each other and misused, and left dead for higher knowledge and unheeded in the street, given over to the scorn of the unintelligent ; but the time has apparently come when they are to rise victoriously again, as loud witnesses of the long misunderstood divine truth, to ever greater glorification of the same in science as in life. One does religion or rather the two a disservice when one puts religion in opposition to science, to which this esoteric of world history also belongs so essentially. If now in this first attempt at a deeper understanding of this subject, there should also be found some things that may perhaps be “an offense to the Jews and 'a foolishness to the Greeks,” as more often than not what is thought of as science is what is Christian in thought with science; but I know that this way, which I have tried to point out here, will be more and more recognized and developed into a general one, because it is the right one.

Friedrich v. sechlegel.